

REMARKS

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. First, Applicant has amended the specification to make it clear that the locating flanges are the ears denoted by reference numbers 14a-b and 16a-b. Also, the ends claimed in claim 1 are the ends of the connector embedded in the concrete, as seen in Figures 3 and 4. The ends are more than the points denoted by reference numbers 24 and 26; the ends are the entire part of the overmolded component that is embedded in concrete.

Replacement drawings have been included to show that the ridges at the upper end of the connector should have been labeled with the number 20, the same as the ridges are labeled at the lower end of the connector. Reference number 22 refers to the separate washer seen in Fig. 2, and should not have been used in Fig. 1.

The examiner has requested replacement drawings to show the locating flanges. As indicated above, these locating flanges are in the Figures at reference numbers 14a-b and 16a-b.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-7 under Section 112 for failing to particularly point out the invention. Specifically, the examiner points out that each over-molded component may have an end rather than ends. The claims have been amended to indicate that the component may have an end instead of ends.

Claims 1-3, 5, and 7 are rejected under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,829,733 to Long. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. The Long reference does not have several of the features claimed by Applicant. First, the Long reference does not have overmolded components comprising ends embedded in the concrete. The overmolded sleeve of Long is in the middle of the component, not at the end. In addition, the Long reference does not have the locating flanges that Applicant claims. With Applicant's clarification that the locating flanges are denoted by reference numbers 14a-b and 16a-b, it should now be clear that the Long references does not have the locating flanges as claimed by Applicant.

As the Long reference does not disclose several elements of the claimed invention, the examiner's rejection of claim 6 under 103(a) referring to Long and Keith must also fail. The

combination of Long and Keith fails to show overmolded components with at least one end embedded in the concrete and one or more locating flanges.

The application has been amended to correct minor informalities, to further distinguish the application over the prior art, and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention so as to place the application, as a whole, into a prima facie condition for allowance.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that its claims 1-7 are in condition for allowance at this time, patentably distinguishing over the cited prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and passage to allowance are respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully urged to call the undersigned attorney at (515) 288-2500 to discuss the claims in an effort to reach a mutual agreement with respect to claim limitations in the present application which will be effective to define the patentable subject matter if the present claims are not deemed to be adequate for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 6, 2006



Emily E. Harris
Registration No. 56,201
DAVIS, BROWN, KOEHN,
SHORS & ROBERTS, P.C.
666 Walnut St., Suite 2500
Des Moines, Iowa 50309
Telephone: (515) 288-2500

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT